

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 7 10 and 19. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

In the Final Office Action, claims 1 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. The Advisory Action indicated in paragraph 7, that section 112 rejection would be overcome

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1-14 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 02/011467 to Jones et al (hereinafter "Jones") in view of US Pat Publication Number 2003/0051041 to Kalavade et al (hereinafter "Kalavade") and US Patent Number 7,184,764 to Raviv et al (hereinafter "Raviv"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The present invention discloses a Single Sign-On method having distinguishing features which are neither anticipated nor suggested by the cited art. The Jones and Kalavade references apply to providing services where the services are accessible after a first authentication; that is, no further authentication is required to access the services, so a Single Sign On system is not necessary. The application of a SSO system, on the other hand, indicates that a network, which is a trusted member of a group of networks, authenticates a user and any subsequent networks visited by the user have a mechanism to verify that the user had been authenticated by the original trusted network.

In this respect, nothing in Jones or Kalavade or Raviv discloses or suggests redirecting a user, who accesses a service provider after having been authenticated by

the home network, towards the home network via a global Single Sign-On Front End (G-SSO-FE) for obtaining an SSO authentication assertion (or token). Kalavade teaches, as noted by the Examiner, the forwarding of the user's phone number and other information back to the accounting and billing server. The phone number and password are user credentials used for authenticating the user. Submission of these credentials throughout the network is one of the drawbacks prevented by SSO services. In contrast, the present invention teaches that the user is redirected to a home network to obtain an SSO authentication assertion, the assertion is not authentication data used for authenticating the user. The authentication data represents the positive authentication of the user to the Single Sign on system. This information is retained by the SSO and not revealed to any other requestor; only the token and the ability to check the authentication status of the user are provided.

Furthermore, neither Jones nor Kalavade nor Raviv disclose receiving a Single Sign-On authentication assertion, either from the user or from an entity where the assertion was generated. And, the assertion is received, by the requesting service provider along with an address of the entity providing the authentication; and allowing validation of the Single Sign-On authentication assertion by the entity that generated the assertion.

The Examiner indicates that "...forwarding of the phone number and other information back to the accounting and billing server..." anticipates the redirection of the user towards the home network for obtaining the SSO authentication assertion. On its face this is wrong. In the present invention, the user provides a token to a requesting service provider, the token provided by the SSO, and the address of the SSO that provided the token. The SSO is trusted by the members and service providers of the network federation and receipt of the token enables a check with the SSO to confirm the authentication of the user. Neither Jones, Kalavade nor Raviv disclose this limitation, and the skilled person would not combine the three references, since the cited prior art employs user data as authentication information to each service provider requiring authentication information. This is in contrast to the Applicant's invention which provides

a token and address provided by the SSO system for checking authentication status of the user (thus not revealing any personal information).

Moreover, neither Jones nor Kalavade nor Raviv disclose receiving at the service provider an SSO authentication assertion and validating the SSO authentication assertion using the address of the entity that generated the assertion.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not disclose individually or in combination, the limitations of claims 1 and 10. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claims 1 and 10 and since the depending claims contain the same limitations, the Applicant requests the allowance of dependent claims 2-9, 11-14 and 19

Claims 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jones and Kalavade as applied to claims 1-14 above, and further in view of US Patent 6,578,085 to Khalil et al (hereinafter "Khalil"). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Khalil reference is cited as disclosing tracking IP addresses assigned by a number of foreign networks and determining visited networks which assigned IP addresses to a user. However, tracking the IP addresses to determine visited networks does not disclose that the user was authenticated by the visited networks nor are the networks disclosed as being trusted by the other networks with regards to authentication. The Applicant respectfully submits that Khalil fails to disclose the missing limitations, as described above that are lacking in the cited references Jones and Kalavade. Without the described limitations, the combination of Jones, Kalavade and Khalil fail to disclose or teach, individually or in combination, the limitations of claim 10 and thus claims 15-18.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: September 9, 2009

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com